



**UNITED STATES DEPARTMENT OF COMMERCE  
Patent and Trademark Office**

Address: COMMISSIONER OF PATENTS AND TRADEMARKS  
Washington, D.C. 20231

SERIAL NUMBER	FILING DATE	FIRST NAMED INVENTOR	ATTORNEY DOCKET NO.
---------------	-------------	----------------------	---------------------

02/058,074 05/04/93 WILENS

23M1/0822

JASON J. YOUNG  
6001 W. BIG BEAVER ROAD  
SUITE 624  
TROY, MI 48064-3109

P. 05/08/94  
EXAMINER

TRAN, K

ART UNIT PAPER NUMBER

7

2311

DATE MAILED:

08/22/94

08/22/94

This is a communication from the examiner in charge of your application.  
COMMISSIONER OF PATENTS AND TRADEMARKS

☒ This application has been examined ☒ Responsive to communication filed on 4/18/94 ☒ This action is made final.

A shortened statutory period for response to this action is set to expire 3 month(s), 8 day(s) from the date of this letter.  
Failure to respond within the period for response will cause the application to become abandoned. 35 U.S.C. 133

**Part I THE FOLLOWING ATTACHMENT(S) ARE PART OF THIS ACTION:**

- |   |   |
|---|---|
| 1. <input type="checkbox"/> Notice of References Cited by Examiner, PTO-892.        | 2. <input type="checkbox"/> Notice of Draftsman's Patent Drawing Review, PTO-948. |
| 3. <input type="checkbox"/> Notice of Art Cited by Applicant, PTO-1449.             | 4. <input type="checkbox"/> Notice of Informal Patent Application, PTO-152.       |
| 5. <input type="checkbox"/> Information on How to Effect Drawing Changes, PTO-1474. | 6. <input type="checkbox"/>   |

**Part II SUMMARY OF ACTION**

1. ☒ Claims 1-20 are pending in the application.  
Of the above, claims \_\_\_\_\_ are withdrawn from consideration.
2. ☐ Claims \_\_\_\_\_ have been cancelled.
3. ☐ Claims \_\_\_\_\_ are allowed.
4. ☒ Claims 1-20 are rejected.
5. ☐ Claims \_\_\_\_\_ are objected to.
6. ☐ Claims \_\_\_\_\_ are subject to restriction or election requirement.
7. ☐ This application has been filed with informal drawings under 37 C.F.R. 1.85 which are acceptable for examination purposes.
8. ☐ Formal drawings are required in response to this Office action.
9. ☐ The corrected or substitute drawings have been received on \_\_\_\_\_. Under 37 C.F.R. 1.84 these drawings are ☐ acceptable; ☐ not acceptable (see explanation or Notice of Draftsman's Patent Drawing Review, PTO-948).
10. ☒ The proposed additional or substitute sheet(s) of drawings, filed on April 18, 94 has (have) been ☒ approved by the examiner; ☐ disapproved by the examiner (see explanation).
11. ☐ The proposed drawing correction, filed \_\_\_\_\_, has been ☐ approved; ☐ disapproved (see explanation).
12. ☐ Acknowledgement is made of the claim for priority under 35 U.S.C. 119. The certified copy has ☐ been received ☐ not been received ☐ been filed in parent application, serial no. \_\_\_\_\_; filed on \_\_\_\_\_.
13. ☐ Since this application appears to be in condition for allowance except for formal matters, prosecution as to the merits is closed in accordance with the practice under Ex parte Quayle, 1935 C.D. 11; 453 O.G. 213.
14. ☐ Other

**EXAMINER'S ACTION**

Art Unit: 2311

1. This Office Action is in response to the Amendment filed on April 18, 1994. Claims 2 and 4-5 have been cancelled. Newly added claims 16-20 have been entered.

2. Claims 1-20 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. § 103 as being unpatentable over Barber as previously applied and in view of comments below.

As per claim 1, Barber teaches a device having the first key entry means for selectively displaying screens by a player (col. 7, lines 52-54), the second field keys means for selecting a particular field of predefined data on the screen (see Fig.6 and a cursor key 60) and the third values select key means for displaying and altering data in the selected field (col.7, lines 58-61). Barber does not specifically teach the use of tab keys and scroll keys used to move the cursor from one place to another place. It would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art in a computer device to move cursor on the display by using a keyboard having up-down arrows and left-right arrows (scroll-keys) in order to retrieve and enter data.

Claims 2-9 remains rejected in view Barber as set forth in the prior Office Action.

As per claim 10, Barber does not specifically teach displaying a choose game-interactive recording screen. However, Barber teaches selecting one of the hole numbers and getting a view of the entire hole on the display device. It would have

Art Unit: 2311

been obvious to one ordinary skill in the art at the time the invention was made to select one of the game-interactive screens for entering or changing data while the game (i.e golf game) is being played.

Claim 11 remains rejected in view of Barber as set forth in the prior Office Action.

As per claim 12, Barber does not explicitly teach screen-dependent data input fields. It is not clear on what limitations are in the claim. In addition, as discussed above in the body of rejection, Barber allows for alteration of predefined fields. Barber does not explicitly teach a pre-game and game-interactive screens. However, one of ordinary skill in the art would have created a set up screens on the computer before the beginning of the game, entered and stored data during the game being played. The motivation would be to enable the player to modify golf play parameters.

Claim 13-14 remain rejected in view Barber as set forth in the prior Office Action.

As per claim 15 is rejected as discussed above in claims 10 and 12.

As per claim 16, Barber discloses a game first interactive screen (denoted as figure 6) which illustrates a first level of recording of the fairway with hazards and distances and par numbers. Barber also illustrates on figure 7 a second screen of

Art Unit: 2311

an enlarged view of a particular green (as was displayed in figure 6) in which all relevant general information for that particular green is shown. While Barber does not explicitly state a level of reporting, however, the Examiner asserts that since all relevant information for that particular green are displayed, one of ordinary skill in the art would have concluded that the displaying of all relevant information for a particular green is in essence similar to the claimed "reporting" since the phrase reporting implies "displaying to" or "describing the contents of" the particular subject of interest.

As per claims 17 and 18, use of means to select the particular data (including screens) to be displayed is well known in the art. The motivation to use a selection means in Barber would have been to allow a user to go directly to the desired information (i., pre-game data).

Claims 19-20 contain similar limitations addressed in claims 1, 10 and 12 and therefore are rejected under a similar rationale.

**3. Responses to the arguments:**

Applicant argues that Barber is limited in its performance capacities by the fact that data selection and entry is largely key-dependent rather than screen-dependent as in the claimed invention.

Art Unit: 2311

The Examiner's response for this argument has been discussed in the rejection of claim 1 above.

Applicant argues that Barber lacks the following features of Applicant's invention: storing a particular of pre-game, game-interactive and post-information screens, displaying pre-game screens to define parameters of the game to be played, providing a choice among a plurality of game-interactive screens corresponding to the parameters entered in the pre-game screens.

In response, Examiner contends that the storing and displaying pre-game information is obvious in view of Barber's device although not explicitly recited therein. Any computer implemented game must have this feature in order to be run as an interactive program (see col.3, lines 51-56) so that the player can be better to interact with the game, and Barber teaches providing post-game reports based on the data entered in the game-interactive screen for summarizing the results of the game such as display of player name, date, performance data of players, total scores... (see col.7, lines 3-15). Barber does not explicitly teach post-game information screens. However; it would have been obvious to one having ordinary skill in the art at the time the invention was made to include screens showing information of post-games and store these information in order to keep track the results of the games. The motivation would be to review the past performance of players.

Art Unit: 2311

4. **THIS ACTION IS MADE FINAL.** Applicant is reminded of the extension of time policy as set forth in 37 C.F.R. § 1.136(a).

A SHORTENED STATUTORY PERIOD FOR RESPONSE TO THIS FINAL ACTION IS SET TO EXPIRE THREE MONTHS FROM THE DATE OF THIS ACTION. IN THE EVENT A FIRST RESPONSE IS FILED WITHIN TWO MONTHS OF THE MAILING DATE OF THIS FINAL ACTION AND THE ADVISORY ACTION IS NOT MAILED UNTIL AFTER THE END OF THE THREE-MONTH SHORTENED STATUTORY PERIOD, THEN THE SHORTENED STATUTORY PERIOD WILL EXPIRE ON THE DATE THE ADVISORY ACTION IS MAILED, AND ANY EXTENSION FEE PURSUANT TO 37 C.F.R. § 1.136(a) WILL BE CALCULATED FROM THE MAILING DATE OF THE ADVISORY ACTION. IN NO EVENT WILL THE STATUTORY PERIOD FOR RESPONSE EXPIRE LATER THAN SIX MONTHS FROM THE DATE OF THIS FINAL ACTION.

5. Any inquiry concerning this communication or earlier communications from the examiner should be directed to Khai Tran, whose telephone number is (703) 305-9776. The examiner can normally be reached on "Monday-Friday" from 7:30AM to 5:00PM. The examiner can also be reached on alternate "Monday".

If attempts to reach the examiner by telephone are unsuccessful, the examiner's supervisor, Gail Hayes, can be reached on (703) 305-9711. The fax phone number for this Group is (703) 305-9564 or 9565.

Any inquiry of a general nature or relating to the status of this application should be directed to the Group receptionist whose telephone number is (703) 305-3800.

*lt*  
Tran, K  
July 23, 1994

*Gail Hayes*  
GAIL O. HAYES  
PRIMARY EXAMINER  
GROUP 2300